IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JERMAINE MYERS 305 S. 1st Avenue Coatesville, PA 19320

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

No.:

v.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

SMS MILL SERVICES COATESVILLE, LLC
139 Modena Road
ArcelorMittal Steel Complex
Coatesville, PA 19320
and
SCRAP METAL SERVICES, LLC
13830 Brainard Avenue
Burnham, IL 60633
and
ROY KERRIGAN
c/o SMS Mill Services Coatesville LLC
139 Modena Road
ArcelorMittal Steel Complex

Defendants.

Coatesville, PA 19320

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Jermaine Myers (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

I. Introduction

1. Plaintiff initiates the instant action to redress violations by Defendants of 42 U.S.C. § 1981. Plaintiff was unlawfully terminated by Defendants, and he seeks damages as set forth herein.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

- 2. This action is initiated pursuant to a federal law. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the claims arise under the laws of the United States.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because their contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in <u>International Shoe Co. v. Washington</u> 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Venue is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), because Defendants reside in and/or conduct business in this judicial district and because a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

III. Parties

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 7. Defendant SMS Mill Services Coatesville LLC ("Defendant Mill") is a wholly owned subsidiary of Defendant Scrap Metal Services, LLC ("Defendant Parent"). Defendant Mill provides on-site scrap management to support various steel mills around the United States. Upon information and belief, Defendant Parent advertises for Defendant Mill, oversees Defendant Mill, sets policies and standards within Defendant Mill, sets guidelines and targets, and has overlapping resources financially and through management.

- 8. Defendants have such a close relationship in that Defendant Mill is treated more like a branch than a separate legal entity that they should be considered joint, single, and/or integrated employers for the purposes of this action.
- 9. Defendant Roy Kerrigan (hereinafter "Defendant Kerrigan") is upon information and belief a manager of Defendant Mill who controls and manages the terms and conditions of employment for employees who work for Defendants including but not limited to their termination.
- 10. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendants.

IV. <u>Factual Background</u>

- 11. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated here in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 12. Plaintiff is an African-American male.
 - 13. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants for approximately six years.
- 14. At the time of Plaintiff's termination, he was employed at Defendants' Coatesville, Pennsylvania location as a crane operator.
- 15. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff performed his work duties in a satisfactory manner.
- 16. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants and as of the date he was ultimately terminated, Plaintiff was supervised by Defendant Kerrigan who is Caucasian.

- 17. On or about February 14, 2011, Plaintiff was terminated by Defendants and told it was because he was convicted of a DUI, and Plaintiff was instructed that he was not eligible for re-hire for that reason.
- 18. Prior to his termination, Plaintiff informed Defendants that he was eligible to participate in a work-release program and could continue his employment with Defendants.
- 19. Despite that other Caucasian employees had received DUIs and remained employed with Defendants, Defendants still terminated Plaintiff.
- 20. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that his termination was motivated by his race for two reasons: (1) he had been treated disparately as compared to non-black employees by Defendant Kerrigan within the workplace; and (2) Defendant allowed non-black employees with DUI arrests and convictions to remain employed.
- 21. Upon information and belief, one Adam Furlong (Caucasian) had DUI convictions but was re-hired and/or remained employed by Defendants.
- 22. Upon information and belief, Defendants were aware of Furlong's DUI conviction(s) because Furlong informed Defendant' management of such, and Defendant Kerrigan visited and/or provided Furlong a ride from the correctional facility where he was incarcerated (for a DUI) to Defendants' location on at least one occasion.
- 23. Another Caucasian employee, one Jake Garifalco, upon information and belief also had a DUI and was incarcerated, but he was re-hired and/or remained employed by Defendants.
- 24. Defendants terminated Plaintiff for reasons that were selectively enforced on the basis of race.
 - 25. As a result of Defendants' aforementioned actions, Plaintiff suffered damages.

4

Count I <u>Violation(s) of 42 U.S.C. Section 1981</u> (Racial Discrimination) - Against All Defendants -

- 26. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 27. Plaintiff was subjected to racially discriminatory treatment and terminated by Defendants after informing them of his DUI conviction.
- 28. Upon information and belief, Caucasian and/or non-black employees with DUI conviction(s) remained employed and/or were re-hired after management became aware if their DUI conviction(s).
- 29. Defendants terminated Plaintiff (African-American) for reasons that were selectively enforced on the basis of race.
- 30. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of 42 U.S.C. Section 1981.

 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:
- A. Defendants are to be prohibited from continuing to maintain their illegal policy, practice or custom of discriminating/retaliating against employees and are to be ordered to promulgate an effective policy against such unlawful acts and to adhere thereto;
- B. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to past lost earnings, future lost earnings, salary, pay increases, bonuses, medical and other benefits, training, promotions, pension, and seniority. Plaintiff should be accorded those benefits illegally withheld from the date he first suffered retaliation/interference at the hands of Defendants until the date of verdict;

C. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an

amount determined by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for their

willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendants or other employers

from engaging in such misconduct in the future;

D. Plaintiff is to be accorded any and all other equitable and legal relief as the Court

deems just, proper and appropriate, including but not limited to, emotional distress and/or pain

and suffering damages (where legally permitted);

E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable

legal fees as provided by applicable federal and state law;

F. Any verdict in favor of Plaintiff is to be molded by the Court to maximize the

financial recovery available to the Plaintiff in light of the caps on certain damages set forth in

applicable federal law; and

G. Plaintiff's claims are to receive trial by jury to the extent allowed by applicable

law. Plaintiff has also endorsed this demand on the caption of this Complaint in accordance with

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari Karpf

3331 Street Road

Two Greenwood Square

Suite 128

Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: April 5, 2012

6

Case 2:12-cv-01736-LDD Document 1 Filed 04/06/12 Page 7 of 9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Jern	raine	Myers
	3	1

CIVIL ACTION

SWS	Mill	SONICOS	coatesville, Lic, et al.	NO.
-----	------	---------	--------------------------	-----

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CA	ASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:
--------------------------------	------------------------

 Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address				
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com				
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for				
4/192012	Ari R. Karpf	Plaintiff	(')			
(f) Standard Manageme	nt - Cases that do not fall into any	one of the other tracks.	(X)			
commonly referred to	 Cases that do not fall into track o as complex and that need specia se side of this form for a detailed 	l or intense management by	()			
*	exposure to asbestos.					
(d) Asbestos - Cases inv	olving claims for personal injury	or property damage from				
(c) Arbitration - Cases r	c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
(a) Habeas Corpus - Car	Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:12-cv-01736-LDD Document 1 Filed 04/06/12 Page 8 of 9 DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes No DX Not Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? YesD RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: _ Date Terminated: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes 🗆 No□ CIVIL: (Place of in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1.

Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1.

Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. G FELA 2.

Airplane Personal Injury □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3.

Assault, Defamation 4.
Antitrust 4.

Marine Personal Injury 5.
Patent 5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please Labor-Management Relations specify) Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. D Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability - Asbestos 9. D Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) Ari R. Karpf counsel of record do hereby certify: knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ARK2484

D	Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, 000.00 exclusive of interest and co	Section	13(c)(2),	, that to the	e best-of	my k
150.	000.00 exclusive of interest and co	sts:				.,

Attorney l.D.#

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any ease now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above

Attorney-at-Law

Attorney-at-Law

ARK2484

Attorney I.D.# 91538

CIV. 609 (6/08)

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08) Case 2:12-cv-01736-LDD Document 1 Filed 04/06/12 Page 9 of 9

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
MYERS, JERMAINE	3		SMS MILL S	ERVICES COATES	VILLE, LLC, et al.
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Chester			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Chester		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, Telephone Number and Email Address Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, P.C., 3331 Street Road, Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128, Bensalem, PA 19020, (215) 639-0801, akarpf@karpf-law.com				D CONDEMNATION CASES, US INVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) P	TF DEF I Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF incipal Place
Defendant	 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) 	1	en of Another State	1 2	
			en or Subject of a reign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	O 6 O 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)	OFFICE AND AND RESERVED A		h indonesia esperante	PROCESSION AND ADDRESS OF THE PROCES
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 199 All Other Real Property 1	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 385 Property Dan 385 Property Dan	URY 61 62 62 62 62 63 64 64 64 64 64 64 64	0 Agriculture 0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 424 USC 157 425 USC 157 425 USC 158 425 USC 158 US	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 401 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X) 1 Original D 2 Remove State (Court Appellate Court	Reo	pened stated of 1 3 anoth	ferred from G Multidistrer district Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	IBrief description of cause:		Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	Violations of 42 USC 198 ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTUUNDER F.R.C.P. 23		EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE(S	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
AU2012		17		-	
DATE	SIGNATURE	ATTO	RNEY OF RECORD		

Print

Save As...

Export as PDF

Retrieve PDF File

Reset